REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further consideration are requested.

Claims 1-16 and 18 were pending in this application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, 7-11, 14 and 18 are amended herein, and claims 6 and 16 are cancelled herein. Thus, claims 1-5, 7-15 and 18 are currently pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

Initially, the Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for conducting a telephone interview on September 5, 2008 and a follow-up discussion on September 8, 2008. During these discussions, the applied art and arguments distinguishing the claims over the applied prior art were discussed, as well as proposed claim amendments. During the discussions, it was agreed that the subject matter of claim 6 appeared to distinguish over the references applied by the Examiner. Moreover, it was agreed that if the subject matter of claim 6 was incorporated into claim 1, that claim 1 would also distinguish over the references applied by the Examiner. However, the Examiner indicated that further search and/or consideration would be required before making a final decision.

The claims have been rejected as indicated below.

Claims 1-6, 12-16 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takano (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,214) (hereinafter referred to as "Takano") in view of Shitahaku (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0037753) (hereinafter referred to as "Shitahaku").

Claims 6 and 16 are cancelled herein, thus rendering the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of these claims moot.

Claims 7-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takano in view of Shitahaku and further in view of Hourvitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,388,201) (hereinafter referred to as "Hourvitz"). Although claim 11 is not included in the listing of claims in this rejection, it is included in the discussion of this rejection on page 17 of the Office Action. Thus, the Applicants consider claim 11 to be included in this 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of previously pending claim 6. Thus, as discussed during the September 5, 2008 interview, claim 1

distinguishes over the references cited by the Examiner. Support for the amendments can be found in the substitute specification in paragraphs [0045] to [0055].

The above rejections are submitted to be inapplicable to the amended claims for the following reasons.

With exemplary reference to the Figures, claim 1 sets forth a display screen management apparatus, comprising: a saving section 104 for saving screen information and screen resources about the plurality of screens; and a display screen management unit 10 comprising a computer program recorded on a computer-readable storage medium that causes the display screen management apparatus to execute at least switching and displaying of a plurality of screens on a display device 106 by screen transition, the computer program of the display screen management unit comprising: an instruction section 102 operable to provide an instruction to display one of the plurality of screens as a switching target screen over at least another one of the plurality of screens as a currently displayed screen in response to an external request; a screen control section 103 operable to control a display on the display device 106 in accordance with the instruction from the instruction section 102; and a screen discard determination section 105 operable to compare the currently displayed screen with the switching target screen indicated by the instruction section 102, based on the screen information saved in the saving section 104 , to determine whether or not the currently displayed screen is to be discarded, such that when all or a part of the currently displayed screen is displayed simultaneously with the switching target screen the currently displayed screen is not to be discarded, and when the currently displayed screen is completely hidden by the switching target screen the currently displayed screen is to be discarded. When the screen discard determination section 105 determines that the currently displayed screen is to be discarded, the screen control section 103 discards a screen resource and information about the currently displayed screen from the saving section 104.

Thus, claim 1 requires a screen discard determination section operable to compare a currently displayed screen with a switching target screen indicated by an instruction section, based on screen information saved in a saving section, to determine whether or not the currently displayed screen is to be discarded, such that when all or a part of the currently displayed screen is displayed simultaneously with the switching target screen

the currently displayed screen is not to be discarded, and when the currently displayed screen is completely hidden by the switching target screen the currently displayed screen is to be discarded. When the screen discard determination section determines that the currently displayed screen is to be discarded, the screen control section discards a screen resource and information about the currently displayed screen from the saving section.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Takano discloses the features of previously pending claim 6, which are incorporated into claim 1 herein. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that Takano discloses these features because it describes that "sharing the display control attributes of the display attribute storage portion 113 obviates the need to prepare attributes for each of the application units 12(1) to 12(n), thereby reducing the volume of attribute data to be stored in the display attribute storage portion 113 (Takano, col 8, ln 4-9)."

However, in contrast to the present invention as recited in amended claim 1, Takano does not disclose comparing a currently displayed screen with a switching target screen indicated by an instruction section, such that when the currently displayed screen is completely hidden by the switching target screen the currently displayed screen is to be discarded.

Instead, Takano discloses display update processing executed in a display unit 11 based on display control attributes preset in a display control attribute table in response to only one issuance of a display operation command by display instruction portions 120(1) to 120(n) of application units 12(1) to 12(n) (see col. 7, lines 56-62). Thus, because one display operation needs only one command, no performance degradation is caused even when the application units 12(1) to 12(n) and the display control unit 11 are provided at different positions in a low speed network (see col. 7, line 66 to col. 8, line 3).

Moreover, there is no disclosure or suggestion to modify Takano such that the display control unit 11 compares screens to determine whether a currently displayed screen is completely hidden by another screen, and discarding the currently displayed screen on the basis of this determination.

In other words, Takano <u>does not</u> disclose *a screen discard determination section operable to compare the currently displayed screen with the switching target screen indicated by the instruction section, based on the screen information saved in the saving*

section, to determine whether or not the currently displayed screen is to be discarded,
such that when all or a part of the currently displayed screen is displayed simultaneously
with the switching target screen the currently displayed screen is not to be discarded, and
when the currently displayed screen is completely hidden by the switching target screen
the currently displayed screen is to be discarded. *When the screen discard determination*
section determines that the currently displayed screen is to be discarded, _the screen_
control section discards a screen resource and information about the currently displayed
screen *from the saving section.*

For at least the reasons discussed above, it is believed clear that Takano fails to disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in claim 1.

Regarding the combination of Takano and Shitahaku, Shitahaku is relied upon in the rejection as teaching "a screen discard determination section operable to compare the currently displayed screen with the switching target screen indicated by the instruction section based on the screen information saved in the saving section, to determine whether or not the currently displayed screen is to be discarded," and teaching "wherein, when the screen discard determination section determines that the currently displayed screen is discarded, the screen control section discard information about the currently displayed screen from the saving section."

However, in contrast to the present invention, Shitahaku does not disclose comparing the currently displayed screen with a switching target screen indicated by an instruction section, such that when the currently displayed screen is completely hidden by the switching target screen the currently displayed screen is to be discarded.

Instead, Shitahaku discloses that an operation control section 21 compares the priority of an application currently being displayed at a front position on a screen with the priority of an application from which a launch instruction was received, to determine which application to make active, but not for the purpose of determining whether or not a currently displayed screen is to be discarded.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Shitahaku to modify the operation control section 21 to compare the currently displayed application with the application from which a launch instruction was received, in order to determine whether the currently displayed application is completely hidden by the application from which a

launch instruction was received, and discarding the currently displayed application on the basis of this determination. Thus, it is clear that Shitahaku also fails to disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of the display screen management apparatus recited in claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that by "making active the application the launch instruction was received, Shitahaku discards the previously active application." During the September 5 interview, the Examiner explained that he broadly interpreted "discard," in the context of Shitahaku, to mean moving a screen from a front position to another position in a screen queue. However, as discussed above, Shitahaku does not disclose comparing screens to determine whether a currently displayed screen is completely hidden by another screen, and discarding the currently displayed screen on the basis of this determination.

The Examiner cited Hourvitz for teaching a controller used to monitor window size, position and status. However, it is clear that Hourvitz also fails to disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of the display screen management apparatus, recited in claim 1.

Regarding claims 14 and 18, they are patentable over the references relied upon in the rejection for reasons similar to those set forth above in support of claim 1. That is, claims 14 and 18 similarly include, in part, *comparing a currently displayed screen with a switching target screen based on previously saved screen information, such that when all or a part of the currently displayed screen is displayed simultaneously with the switching target screen the currently displayed screen is not to be discarded, and when the currently displayed screen is completely hidden by the switching target screen the currently displayed screen is to be discarded.* Moreover, claims 14 and 18 include *discarding information about the currently displayed screen when a determining operation determines that the currently displayed screen is to be discarded.*

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the above-discussed features as recited in claims 1, 14 and 18 are not disclosed in the references applied by the Examiner. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have found it obvious to modify Takano under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in such a manner as to result in the invention of

claims 1, 14 and 18. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and claims 2-5 and 7-13 depending therefrom, claim 14 and claim 15 depending therefrom, and claim 18, are clearly allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments or remarks, all of the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken YAMASHITA, et al.

By: /Kevin McDermott/
2008.09.22 10:27:09 -04'00'

Kevin McDermott
Registration No. 48,113
Attorney for Applicants

KM/CRW/km
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 22, 2008